

The committee chair has not yet approved these minutes.  
THE INDIANAPOLIS MARION COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT  
CONSOLIDATION COMMITTEE

DATE: April 26, 2006

CALLED TO ORDER: 5:00 p.m.

ADJOURNED: 5:39 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

Attending Members

Lonnell Conley, Chairman  
Lynn McWhirter  
Ron Gibson  
Dane Mahern  
Marilyn Pfisterer  
Lincoln Plowman  
William Oliver

Absent Members

Joanne Sanders

AGENDA

PROPOSAL NO. 170, 2006 - an amendment to General Ordinance No. 110, 2005  
establishing a consolidated law enforcement agency allowing the Minority Leader to  
appoint a designee to serve on the Advisory Committee  
“Do Pass”

Vote: 7-0

**Update on the Law Enforcement Consolidation Process**

## THE INDIANAPOLIS MARION COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT CONSOLIDATION COMMITTEE

The Indianapolis Marion County Law Enforcement Consolidation Committee of the City-County Council met on Wednesday, April 26, 2006. Chairman Lonnell Conley called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. with the following members present: Ron Gibson, Dane Mahern, Marilyn Pfisterer, Lincoln Plowman, William Oliver, and Lynn McWhirter. Absent was Joanne Sanders.

Consent was given to move Phillip Burton from the Marion County Sheriff's Department (MCSD), to the beginning of the agenda.

Deputy Burton presented the committee with the uniforms that were chosen for the new Metropolitan Law Enforcement Agency. He had on display the navy blue uniform that is currently used by the Indianapolis Police Department (IPD). He also has the new patches that will be worn on the uniforms, along with the new badges.

PROPOSAL NO. 170, 2006 - an amendment to General Ordinance No. 110, 2005 establishing a consolidated law enforcement agency allowing the Minority Leader to appoint a designee to serve on the Advisory Committee

Councillor Gibson stated that Councillor Phil Borst sent an email out to all the councilors stating that his business schedule would not allow him to attend the meetings that the Advisory Committee has set and for this reason he would like to appoint someone to serve in his place.

Councillor Oliver asked if this proposal would amend the guidelines to allow the Minority leader to appoint someone to the board. Chairman Conley answered in the affirmative.

Councillor McWhirter stated that the Advisory Committee meets on a day that Councillor Borst has to be in his clinic.

Councillor Gibson moved, seconded by Councillor McWhirter, to send Proposal No. 170, 2006 to the full Council with a "Do Pass" recommendation. The motion carried by a vote of 7-0.

### **Update on the Law Enforcement Consolidation Process**

Penny Davis of the Mayor's Office gave the update on the Law Enforcement Consolidation Process. The update is attached as Exhibit A.

Councillor McWhirter asked if any of the recommendations passed the authority. Ms Davis answered in the negative. Councillor McWhirter asked what the navy blue

uniforms cost. Suzannah Overholt, Transition Director, stated that the uniforms with the high gloss leather and a campaign style hat, cost roughly about \$902,000.

Councillor Plowman asked if the command staff uniforms will be different from the rest of the uniforms. Ms. Davis stated that the uniforms will all be the same.

Chairman Conley asked if the new gray vehicles will be phased into the current fleet of patrol vehicles. Ms. Davis answered in the affirmative. She said the new vehicles will be dark gray and the old vehicles will remain the same with the exception of the re-graphing of the new badge and logo.

Councillor Pfisterer asked if the campaign hat was two times more expensive than the IPD hat and if it was less durable. Ms. Davis stated that the campaign hat is more expensive but the durability is the same. She said it was a nice compromise to make the distinctive uniform, but the Authority committee may say no to the request. Councillor Pfisterer asked if the high gloss belt was less durable compared to the basket weave belt. Ms. Davis stated the durability was about the same for both.

Councillor McWhirter asked if the general orders 32 through 48 were adopted from what was already in place when the departments were separate organizations. Ms. Davis stated that the Policy and Procedure sub-committee took IPD's and MCSD's general orders and overlapped them to come up with the best policy that can come from the two departments. She added that the Commission on Accreditation of Law Enforcement Agency (CALEA) was the final influence on the creation of the new policy.

Councillor Pfisterer asked as to the result of the discussion on Recommendation No. 48. Ms. Davis stated that this recommendation is in regards to off duty employment. She said that it focuses on officers working where alcohol is served. Ms. Davis said that IPD allowed that and MCSD did not. The new department is working on a compromise.

Councillor Gibson stated that he is in support of the officer working when they are off duty and hopes that no restrictions are placed on these officers.

Councillor Plowman if the policies and procedures would be in place prior to January 1, 2007. Ms. Davis answered in the affirmative. Councillor Plowman asked how long it will take for parity in pay to occur. Ms. Davis stated that it was sent for a fiscal impact study.

Councillor McWhirter asked if there was any progress on the social security issue. Ms. Overholt stated that in November the city administration had a conference call with people from federal Social Security in Washington, Baltimore, and Chicago. These people had not heard of Uni-gov before and were wondering why their files did not reflect that in 1970 there had been a change in Indianapolis/Marion County Government. Since then federal Social Security had been fixated on correcting their records, with respect to Uni-gov. They are requiring an opinion from the Indiana Attorney General

regarding the legal status of the Consolidated City of Indianapolis versus the Civil City of Indianapolis because of Uni-gov in 1970. Ms. Overholt said that the opinion will be sent to federal Social Security within the next two weeks. After the opinion is received, Social Security will set the requirement status of the Metropolitan Police Department. Social Security official said that their inclination would be that all individuals would not be covered by social security. She said that the argument is that city administration wants the deputies that are currently in the sheriffs department and on social security to have the option to choose to be in or out.

Councillor McWhirter asked what the consequences are, if a decision about the Social Security issue is not made by the time the new department is final. Ms. Overholt stated that this will not delay the consolidation, and it should not impact what happens after January 1, 2007.

#### CONCLUSION

With no further business pending, and upon motion duly made, the Indianapolis Marion County Law Enforcement Consolidation Committee of the City-County Council was adjourned at 5:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lonell Conley, Chairman  
The Indianapolis Marion County  
Law Enforcement Consolidation  
Committee

LC/rjp